Spacetime Variation of Lorentz-Violation Coefficients at Nonrelativistic Scale

Charles D. Lane*
Physics Department, Berry College, Mount Berry, GA 30149-5004 and
Indiana University Center for Spacetime Symmetries,
Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana 47405-7105
(Dated: July 15, 2016)

The notion of uniform and/or constant tensor fields of rank > 0 is incompatible with general curved spacetimes. This work considers the consequences of certain tensor-valued coefficients for Lorentz violation in the Standard-Model Extension varying with spacetime position. We focus on two of the coefficients, a_μ and b_μ, that characterize Lorentz violation in massive fermions, particularly in those fermions that constitute ordinary matter. We calculate the nonrelativistic hamiltonian describing these effects, and use it to extract the sensitivity of several precision experiments to coefficient variation.

PACS numbers: 11.30.Cp,11.30.Er

arXiv:1605.00512v2 [gr-qc] 14 Jul 2016

I. INTRODUCTION

Local Lorentz symmetry is known to hold to a very high degree in our Universe [1, 2]. However, there remains the possibility that it is broken and that this breaking might manifest itself in extremely precise experiments.

This work adopts the minimal Standard-Model Extension (SME) in curved spacetime [3–7] as a general framework for describing violations of particle Lorentz symmetry. This framework has been used to study many high-precision tests of Lorentz violation, including those that probe interactions involving the constituents of ordinary matter: electrons, neutrons, and protons [1, 8–19].

Lorentz violation in the sector of the minimal SME [7] describing ordinary matter is parameterized by the set of coefficients $a_\mu, \ldots, H_{\mu\nu}$. Most previous comparisons [20–22] between the SME and experimental results assume that these coefficients do not vary with spacetime position. That is, they assume that $\partial_\alpha a_\mu \equiv \cdots \equiv \partial_\alpha H_{\mu\nu} \equiv 0$. In curved spacetime, however, this assumption cannot pertain. Statements involving partial derivatives such as $\partial_\alpha a_\mu \equiv 0$ are coordinate dependent, and therefore may hold in a only a limited set of special frames. There is no *a priori* reason for any experimental frame to be one of these special frames.

One may instead try to impose the coordinate-independent condition $D_\alpha a_\mu \equiv 0$, but this assumption is generally incompatible with nonzero curvature [6]. It implies that $R^\mu{}_{\alpha\nu\beta} a_\mu \equiv 0$, which can only occur if the spacetime has at least one flat direction and if a_μ points along that direction [23]. The spacetimes that are relevant for comparison to experiment, such as Schwarzschild spacetime, do not satisfy this requirement. In this work, we assume that $\partial_\alpha a_\mu \neq 0, \ldots, \partial_\alpha H_{\mu\nu} \neq 0$ and $D_\alpha a_\mu \neq 0, \ldots, D_\alpha H_{\mu\nu} \neq 0$ in general.

This article is organized as follows. Section II collects several small preliminary discussions: conventions, fundamental framework, and some rough estimation of effect sizes. Section III gives a full expression for the relevant nonrelativistic hamiltonian. In Section IV, we isolate the dominant terms, study the C, P, and T properties of derivative interactions, and list the sensitivity of already-completed experiments to derivatives of SME coefficients. A summary appears in Sec. V.

II. BASICS

A. Conventions and Framework

We use Greek indices to denote spacetime coordinates $0, 1, 2, 3$. Latin indices from the beginning of the alphabet $\{a, b, c\}$ denote local Lorentz coordinates $0, 1, 2, 3$, while Latin indices near the middle of the alphabet $\{j, k, \ldots, q\}$ denote local spatial coordinates $1, 2, 3$. We work in a spacetime of metric signature $+2$, so that the flat-spacetime metric η_{ab} is $\mathrm{diag}(-1, +1, +1, +1)$ and $p^j = -i\partial^j$ is the free-particle momentum operator. For ease of application to nonrelativistic systems, we work in the Dirac representation of the gamma matrices: $\gamma^0 = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{1} & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbb{1} \end{pmatrix}$ and $\gamma^j = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \sigma^j \\ -\sigma^j & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, where $\mathbb{1}$ is the 2×2 identity matrix and the usual Pauli matrices are denoted by σ^j. We define the Levi-Cevita symbol so that $[\sigma^j, \sigma^k] = 2i\varepsilon^{jk}{}_l \sigma^l$, which corresponds to the choice $\varepsilon^{12}{}_3 = +1$. We use the shorthand notation $\hbar_{jk} := h_{jk} + \eta_{jk} h_{00}$ for a combination of components of metric perturbation $h_{\mu\nu}$ that appears often. Symmetrization/antisymmetrization involving parentheses/brackets around a pair of indices includes a factor of $1/2$: $T^{(jk)} := \frac{1}{2}(T^{jk} + T^{kj})$ and $T^{[jk]} := \frac{1}{2}(T^{jk} - T^{kj})$.

Lorentz symmetry is known to hold to a very high degree in our universe, and therefore we can expect coefficients for Lorentz violation to be very small. We thus keep only terms up to first order in Lorentz-violation coefficients throughout this work.

Our fundamental framework is the minimal Standard-Model Extension (SME) for a free Dirac fermion in

* clane@berry.edu

weakly curved spacetime with no torsion. Specifically, we work in a spacetime frame where the background metric may be written $g_{\mu\nu} = \eta_{\mu\nu} + h_{\mu\nu}$ with each component $|h_{\mu\nu}| \ll 1$. With this assumption, we neglect any effects that are higher than first order in $h_{\mu\nu}$. Further, we restrict attention to the SME coefficients a_μ and b_μ, assuming that all others $c_{\mu\nu}, \ldots, H_{\mu\nu}$ are identically zero. This corresponds to the action [6]

$$\begin{aligned} S_\psi = \int d^4x \, \{ & \tfrac{1}{2} i \left(\delta_a^\mu - \tfrac{1}{2} h_a^\mu + \tfrac{1}{2}\delta_a^\mu h_\alpha^\alpha\right) \left(\overline{\psi}\gamma^a \partial_\mu \psi - \partial_\mu \overline{\psi}\gamma^a \psi\right) \\ & - \overline{\psi}\left[(1 + \tfrac{1}{2}h_\alpha^\alpha)m + \tfrac{i}{16}\partial_c h_{ab}\{\gamma^a, [\gamma^b, \gamma^c]\}\right]\psi \\ & - \overline{\psi}\left(\delta_a^\mu - \tfrac{1}{2}h_a^\mu + \tfrac{1}{2}h_\alpha^\alpha \delta_a^\mu\right)\left(a_\mu \gamma^a + b_\mu \gamma_5 \gamma^a\right)\psi \} \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

The first two lines in S_ψ are just the usual Lorentz-invariant action for a Dirac fermion in weakly curved spacetime, correct to first order in $h_{\mu\nu}$. The third line contains the coefficient fields for Lorentz violation a_μ and b_μ, which may depend on spacetime position.

After performing a field redefinition $\psi = A\chi$ [4, 24] to ensure conventional time evolution, applying Euler-Lagrange equations, and solving for $i\partial_0\chi = H\chi$, we find a relativistic 4×4 hamiltonian H. This appears identical to the hamiltonian found in [21], though in the present work we consider a_μ and b_μ to depend on spacetime position. It can be organized as

$$H = m\gamma^0 + \mathcal{P} + \mathcal{E} + \mathcal{O} \quad , \tag{2}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P} &= \gamma^0\gamma^j p_j \quad , \\ \mathcal{E} &= \left\{\left[\tfrac{i}{2}\partial^j h_{j0} + a_0 - a^j h_{j0}\right] + \left[-h_{j0}\right]p^j\right\} \\ &\quad + \gamma^0\left\{-\tfrac{1}{2}m h_{00}\right\} \\ &\quad + \gamma^0\gamma^j\gamma_5\left\{\left[\tfrac{1}{4}\varepsilon_{jkl}\partial^k h^{0l} - b_j + \tfrac{1}{2}b^k \hbar_{jk}\right]\right\} \quad , \text{ and} \\ \mathcal{O} &= \gamma^5\left\{-b_0 + b^j h_{j0}\right\} \\ &\quad + \gamma^0\gamma^j\left\{\left[\tfrac{i}{4}\partial^l h_{l0} + a_j - \tfrac{1}{2}a^k\hbar_{jk}\right] + \left[-\tfrac{1}{2}\hbar_{jk}\right]p^k\right\} \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

In this expression, the perturbation terms have been sorted according to their status as 4×4 gamma matrices: Terms in $\mathcal{E}$ have nonzero entries only in the upper-left and lower-right 2×2 blocks, while terms in $\mathcal{O}$ have nonzero entries only in the upper-right and lower-left 2×2 blocks. This sorting is useful for performing a Foldy-Wouthuysen transformation [24–26] to obtain a nonrelativistic hamiltonian that approximates the physics of Eqs. (2) and (3) for low-energy fermions. This hamiltonian may then be used with conventional perturbation theory to derive experimental signals.

B. Predictions Prior to Explicit Calculation

Before performing explicit calculations, it is worth predicting the types of effects that may appear.

1. *Dependence on a_μ.*

In the Minkowski-spacetime SME action, the coefficient a_μ for a single fermion may be removed by a field redefinition $\psi \to \exp\left[if(a_\mu x^\mu)\right]\psi$. In curved spacetime, however, where a_μ may depend on spacetime position, this field redefinition may only be used to remove one component, say, a_0. More precisely: If all four components a_μ for a particular spinor field ψ are nonzero, then we may find a function f such that the redefined spinor acts according to an action with $a_0 = 0$; however, the other three components a_j for the redefined spinor generically will be nonzero and will depend on both the original a_j and the original a_0.

Since one component may be removed in an extended region (rather than at just a single point), all derivatives of this component may also be removed. Thus, rather than the 16 independent derivatives $\partial_\mu a_\nu$ that seem to exist, we expect all physically meaningful effects to depend on at most 12 independent derivatives.

Moreover, when we perform a Foldy-Wouthuysen transformation to extract a nonrelativistic hamiltonian, the coefficient a_μ behaves like the electromagnetic potential $-qA_\mu$ in conventional physics. We therefore expect that measurable physical effects will depend at most on analogues of the field-strength components, $\partial_\mu a_\nu - \partial_\nu a_\mu$, and as part of the kinetic-energy-like term $\frac{1}{2m}(\vec{p} + \vec{a})^2$.

It is worth briefly discussing the similarity of a_μ with $-qA_\mu$. They appear identically in the action for a Dirac fermion, and hence act identically for the calculations done in the current work. However, they are *not* the same, as a physical theory is not defined purely through its action. Other properties of a theory's constituents must be considered. In the case of a_μ versus $-qA_\mu$, it suffices to consider $U(1)$ transformations $\psi \to e^{i\theta}\psi$. The electromagnetic potential $-qA_\mu$ transforms as $-qA_\mu \to -qA_\mu + \partial_\mu\theta$, while the Lorentz-violation coefficients a_μ are invariant: $a_\mu \to a_\mu$.

For the sake of completion, we preserve all components of a_μ in the explicit calculations that follow, though it will be seen that these predictions are vindicated.

2. *Order-of-Magnitude Estimates of Sensitivities.*

Before performing explicit calculations, it is worth estimating the size of terms that could appear in the nonrelativistic hamiltonian. We will then only explicitly calculate terms that are likely to either give relatively large effects or yield sensitivity to previously-unstudied combinations of Lorentz-violation coefficients.

Let k denote a generic SME coefficient (either a_μ or b_μ in this work), ∂ a generic spacetime derivative, p a generic fermion 3-momentum component, m a generic fermion mass, and h a generic component of $h_{\mu\nu}$. In $\hbar = c = 1$ units, k, p, and ∂ have dimensions of mass, while h is dimensionless. For experiments involving atoms near

Factor	Size for nucleons	Size for electrons
h	10^{-9}	10^{-9}
p/m	10^{-2}	10^{-5}
$\partial h/m$	10^{-32}	10^{-29}

TABLE I. Order-of-magnitude estimates of factors that may contribute to terms in the nonrelativistic hamiltonian.

Earth's surface, these factors have the approximate values shown in Table I.

The Foldy-Wouthuysen transformation yields a nonrelativistic hamiltonian that is a sum of terms, each proportional to a power of $1/m^n$ for some positive integer n. (The rest-energy term m is the lone exception.) Each term has a product of nonnegative powers of k, ∂k, h, ∂h, p, and $1/m$, with an appropriate number of factors to give the term an overall dimension of mass. As examples, terms like a_0, $a_j h^{j0}$, and $\delta^{jm}\frac{\partial_j b_k}{m}\frac{p_m}{m}\sigma^k$ may appear.

From Table I, it becomes clear that terms involving ∂h are highly suppressed and do not yield useful sensitivities. We therefore neglect all terms involving derivatives $\partial_\alpha h_{\mu\nu}$ for the rest of this work. Moreover, since the nonconstant nature of SME coefficients might be connected to the size of $h_{\mu\nu}$, we neglect all derivatives of SME coefficients of second and higher order.

III. EXPLICIT CALCULATION

In this section, the nonrelativistic 4×4 hamiltonian H_{NR} is calculated explicitly. The method for doing so is tedious but straightforward, as we can hijack the standard Foldy-Wouthuysen expressions that appear in textbooks [27] for, say, calculating the nonrelativistic hamiltonian for a fermion in the presence of an electromagnetic potential. Keeping terms up to order $1/m^2$,

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\rm NR} = {} & m\gamma^0 + \mathcal{E} + \tfrac{1}{4m}\gamma^0\left(\{\mathcal{P},\mathcal{P}\} + 2\{\mathcal{P},\mathcal{O}\} + \{\mathcal{O},\mathcal{O}\}\right) \\ & - \tfrac{1}{8m^2}\left([\mathcal{P},[\mathcal{P},\mathcal{E}]] + [\mathcal{P},[\mathcal{O},\mathcal{E}]] + [\mathcal{O},[\mathcal{P},\mathcal{E}]]\right. \\ & \left. + i[\mathcal{P},\partial_0\mathcal{O}] + i[\mathcal{O},\partial_0\mathcal{O}]\right) \quad . \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

The full result is unwieldy and difficult to interpret on its own. However, we may fruitfully compare the result to the Minkowski-spacetime, constant-SME-coefficient nonrelativistic hamiltonian $H_{\rm NR,Mink}$ given by equation (24) of Ref. [26]. We can then exploit analysis of $H_{\rm NR,Mink}$ that has already been completed to aid our understanding of weakly-curved-spacetime Lorentz violation.

$H_{\rm NR,Mink}$ includes all fermion-associated Lorentz-violation coefficients $a_\mu,\ldots,H_{\mu\nu}$. However, it suffices for this work to preserve only a_μ, b_μ, $c_{\mu\nu}$, and $d_{\mu\nu}$, setting e_μ, f_μ, $g_{\mu\nu\lambda}$, and $H_{\mu\nu}$ to zero:

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\rm NR,Mink} = {} & \gamma^0\left\{m + \tfrac{1}{2}\delta^{mn}\tfrac{p_m p_n}{m}\right\} \\ & + \mathbb{1}\left\{[a_0] + [m(c^{0m}+c^{m0})]\tfrac{p_m}{m}\right\} \\ & + \gamma^0\left\{[-mc_{00}] + [\delta^{mk}a_k]\tfrac{p_m}{m}\right. \\ & \qquad \left. + [-mc^{mn} - \tfrac{1}{2}m\delta^{mn}c_{00}]\tfrac{p_m p_n}{m^2}\right\} \\ & + \gamma^q\gamma_5\left\{[md_{q0}] + [-b_0\delta^m_q]\tfrac{p_m}{m}\right. \\ & \qquad \left. + [-m\delta^m_q d^{0n} - \tfrac{1}{2}m\delta^m_q d^{n0}]\tfrac{p_m p_n}{m^2}\right\} \\ & + \gamma^0\gamma^q\gamma_5\left\{[-b_q] + [m\delta^{mk}d_{qk} + m\delta^m_q d_{00}]\tfrac{p_m}{m}\right. \\ & \qquad \left. + [\tfrac{1}{2}\delta^{mn}b_q - \tfrac{1}{2}\delta^m_q\delta^{nk}b_k]\tfrac{p_m p_n}{m^2}\right\} \quad . \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

(In this expression and all following analysis, $\mathbb{1}$ denotes the 4×4 identity matrix.)

As an example of the comparison that can be done, $H_{\rm NR}$ contains the term

$$H_{\rm NR} \supset \mathbb{1}\left\{\left[-mh^{m0} - \frac{i\partial_{[j}b_{k]}}{4m}\varepsilon_p{}^{mj}\left(\delta^{kp} - \hbar^{kp}\right)\right]\frac{p_m}{m}\right\} \quad . \tag{6}$$

This involves the same operator as the term $\mathbb{1}\left\{mc^{0m} + mc^{m0}\right\}\frac{p_m}{m}$ in $H_{\rm NR,Mink}$, implying that this derivative effect in weakly curved spacetime acts like an effective value of a Minkowski-space SME coefficient:

$$\left(mc^{0m} + mc^{m0}\right)_{\rm eff} = -mh^{m0} - \frac{i\partial_{[j}b_{k]}}{4m}\varepsilon_p{}^{mj}\left(\delta^{kp} - \hbar^{kp}\right) \quad . \tag{7}$$

The combination $mc^{0m} + mc^{m0}$ has already been analyzed and bounded in existing works [1, 11, 13, 17]. For example, its value in a nonrotating Sun-centered frame $mc^{TX} + mc^{XT}$ associated with electrons is known to be smaller than about 10^{-18} GeV [11, 12]. We can exploit this result to estimate that $|\partial_Y b_Z - \partial_Z b_Y| \lesssim 10^{-21}$ GeV^2 for electrons. Further analysis of this sort appears in Section IV.

The full form of $H_{\rm NR}$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\rm NR} = {} & \gamma^0\left\{m + \tfrac{1}{2}\delta^{mn}\tfrac{p_m p_n}{m}\right\} \\ & + \mathbb{1}\left\{[a_0]_{\rm eff} + [m(c^{0m}+c^{m0})]_{\rm eff}\tfrac{p_m}{m}\right\} \\ & + \gamma^0\left\{[-mc_{00}]_{\rm eff} + [\delta^{mk}a_k]_{\rm eff}\tfrac{p_m}{m}\right. \\ & \qquad \left. + [-mc^{mn} - \tfrac{1}{2}m\delta^{mn}c_{00}]_{\rm eff}\tfrac{p_m p_n}{m^2}\right\} \\ & + \gamma^q\gamma_5\left\{[md_{q0}]_{\rm eff} + [-b_0\delta^m_q]_{\rm eff}\tfrac{p_m}{m}\right. \\ & \qquad \left. + [-m\delta^m_q d^{0n} - \tfrac{1}{2}m\delta^m_q d^{m0}]_{\rm eff}\tfrac{p_m p_n}{m^2}\right\} \\ & + \gamma^0\gamma^q\gamma_5\left\{[-b_q]_{\rm eff} + [m\delta^{mk}d_{qk} + m\delta^m_q d_{00}]_{\rm eff}\tfrac{p_m}{m}\right. \\ & \qquad \left. + [\tfrac{1}{2}\delta^{mn}b_q - \tfrac{1}{2}\delta^m_q\delta^{nk}b_k]_{\rm eff}\tfrac{p_m p_n}{m^2}\right\} \quad , \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where the full set of effective coefficients is collected in Table II. It is worth reiterating a description of the two theories that are being compared in this Table.

Operator	(Minkowski) effective coefficient	Weakly-curved-spacetime coefficient
$\mathbb{1}$	$(a_0)_{\rm eff}$	$a_0 + a_k h^{k0}$
$\mathbb{1}\frac{p_m}{m}$	$(mc^{0m} + mc^{m0})_{\rm eff}$	$mh^{m0} - \frac{\partial_{[j}b_{k]}}{4m}\left(\varepsilon_p{}^{mj}\delta^{kp} - \varepsilon_p{}^{mj}\hbar^{kp}\right)$
γ^0	$(-mc_{00})_{\rm eff}$	$-\frac{1}{2}mh_{00} - \frac{i\partial_{(j}a_{k)}}{2m}\left(\delta^{jk} - \hbar^{jk} + \frac{1}{2}\delta^{jk}h_{00}\right)$
$\gamma^0\frac{p_m}{m}$	$(\delta^{mk}a_k)_{\rm eff}$	$a_k\left(\delta^{km} - \hbar^{km} + \frac{1}{2}\delta^{km}h_{00}\right)$
$\gamma^0\frac{p_m p_n}{m^2}$	$(-mc^{mn} - \frac{1}{2}m\delta^{mn}c_{00})_{\rm eff}$	$-\frac{1}{2}m\left(\hbar^{mn} - \frac{1}{2}m\delta^{mn}h_{00}\right)$
$\gamma^q\gamma_5$	$(md_{q0})_{\rm eff}$	$\frac{\partial_{[j}a_{k]}}{2m}\left(\varepsilon^{jk}{}_q - \varepsilon^{jp}{}_q\hbar^k_p + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^{jk}{}_q h_{00}\right)$ $-\frac{i\partial_j b_0}{2m}\left(-\delta^j_q + \frac{1}{2}\hbar^j_q - \frac{1}{2}\delta^j_q h_{00}\right)$ $+\frac{i\partial_{(j}b_{k)}}{2m}\left(\delta^j_q h^{k0}\right) + \frac{i\partial_{[j}b_{k]}}{2m}\left(\delta^j_q h^{k0}\right)$
$\gamma^q\gamma_5\frac{p_m}{m}$	$(-b_0\delta^m_q)_{\rm eff}$	$b_0\left(-\delta^m_q + \frac{1}{2}\hbar^m_q - \frac{1}{2}\delta^m_q h_{00}\right) + b_k\left(-\delta^m_q h^{k0}\right)$
$\gamma^q\gamma_5\frac{p_m p_n}{m^2}$	$(-m\delta^m_q d^{0n} - \frac{1}{2}m\delta^m_q d^{n0})_{\rm eff}$	0
$\gamma^0\gamma^q\gamma_5$	$(-b_q)_{\rm eff}$	$b_k\left(-\delta^k_q + \frac{1}{2}\hbar^k_q\right)$
$\gamma^0\gamma^q\gamma_5\frac{p_m}{m}$	$(m\delta^{mk}d_{qk} + m\delta^m_q d_{00})_{\rm eff}$	$\frac{\partial_{[j}a_{0]}}{2m}\left(\varepsilon_q{}^{jm} + \varepsilon_q{}^{p[j}\hbar^{m]}{}_p\right) + \frac{\partial_{[j}a_{k]}}{2m}\left(\varepsilon^{jm}{}_q h^{k0}\right)$ $+\frac{i\partial_{(j}b_{k)}}{4m}\left(\varepsilon^{pj}{}_q\varepsilon^{km}{}_p - \delta^m_q\hbar^{jk} + \delta^{mj}\hbar^k_q\right)$ $-\frac{i\partial_{[j}b_{k]}}{4m}\left(\varepsilon^{pm}{}_q\varepsilon^{jk}{}_p - \varepsilon^{pj}{}_q\varepsilon^{km}{}_p + \delta^j_q\hbar^{km} - \delta^{mj}\hbar^k_q\right)$
$\gamma^0\gamma^q\gamma_5\frac{p_m p_n}{m^2}$	$(\frac{1}{2}\delta^{mn}b_q - \frac{1}{2}\delta^m_q\delta^{nk}b_k)_{\rm eff}$	$\frac{1}{2}b_k\left(\varepsilon_q{}^{p(m}\varepsilon^{n)k}{}_p + \delta_q{}^{(m}\hbar^{n)k} - \frac{1}{2}\delta^{mn}\hbar^k_q - \frac{1}{2}\delta^k_q\hbar^{mn}\right)$

TABLE II. Comparison of the nonrelativistic hamiltonians in Minkowski and weakly-curved spacetime. The Minkowski-spacetime hamiltonian may be regarded as an effective cartesian scalar product of the first and second columns (plus the conventional Minkowski-space hamiltonian), while the weakly-curved-spacetime hamiltonian may be regarded as an effective cartesian scalar product of the first and third columns (plus the conventional Minkowski-space hamiltonian).

1. The 2nd column of Table II refers to the minimal SME for a free Dirac fermion in Minkowski spacetime, with nonzero and spacetime-constant coefficients a_μ, b_μ, $c_{\mu\nu}$, and $d_{\mu\nu}$. The nonrelativistic 4×4 hamiltonian for this theory is denoted $H_{\rm NR,Mink}$, and is given explicitly by Eq. (5). Alternatively, $H_{\rm NR,Mink}$ may be reconstituted by adding the effective cartesian scalar product of the first and second columns of Table II to the conventional Minkowski-space hamiltonian.

2. The 3rd column of Table II refers to the minimal SME for a free Dirac fermion in weakly curved spacetime, with nonzero and spacetime-dependent coefficients a_μ and b_μ. The nonrelativistic 4×4 hamiltonian for this theory is denoted $H_{\rm NR}$. This hamiltonian is not given explicitly in this work, but may be easily reconstituted by plugging the relations defined in Table II into Eq. (8). Alternatively, $H_{\rm NR}$ may be reconstituted by adding the effective cartesian scalar product of the first and third columns of Table II to the conventional Minkowski-space hamiltonian.

Each nonrelativistic hamiltonian describes both fermions (with the upper-left 2×2 block) and antifermions (with the lower-right 2×2 block). When applying either hamiltonian to most nonrelativistic systems, however, the antifermion portion is irrelevant. Extracting the fermion portion simply amounts to keeping only the upper-left 2×2 block. The result of this extraction can be found most easily by replacing the operators $\mathbb{1}$ and γ^0 with the 2×2 identity matrix, and replacing $\gamma^q\gamma_5$ and $\gamma^0\gamma^q\gamma_5$ with σ^q.

IV. ANALYSIS

In this section, we try to gain physical insight into $H_{\rm NR}$. We first study the hermiticity of $H_{\rm NR}$ and follow by isolating the dominant contribution to $H_{\rm NR}$ from each derivative that appears. We then briefly consider the C, P, and T properties that can be associated with each combination of SME coefficients that appears therein. Finally, we determine the extent to which existing experiments are sensitive to each combination of derivatives.

A. Hermiticity and Dominant Terms

The Foldy-Wouthuysen process is a unitary transformation, which guarantees that the nonrelativistic hamiltonian is hermitian. However, this hermiticity is not obvious. For example, the term $\frac{1}{2}i\gamma^q\gamma_5\partial_q b_0/m$ is clearly nonhermitian.

The basic issue is that a product of two hermitian operators is itself hermitian if and only if the operators commute. In Minkowski spacetime, b_0 is independent of position, and therefore it commutes with each momentum operator p_j (as does the matrix $\gamma^q\gamma_5$). As a result, the term $-\gamma^q\gamma_5 b_0 p_q/m$ is hermitian in Minkowski spacetime. In curved spacetime, however, b_0 depends on position, and therefore $[p_j, b_0] \neq 0$. As a result, $-\gamma^q\gamma_5 b_0 p_q/m$

is not hermitian in curved spacetime.

While some individual terms may not be hermitian, they form combinations that are hermitian when added. For example, the combination

$$\gamma^q\gamma_5\left(\frac{-b_0p_q+\frac{1}{2}i\partial_q b_0}{m}\right)$$

of the two examples given above is hermitian even though neither term is individually. Each other nonhermitian term in Eq. (8) forms a combination with one or more other terms such that the result is hermitian.

Many of the terms in $H_{\rm NR}$ are suppressed by factors of $h_{\mu\nu}$ relative to other terms. Further, some terms (those containing only m, p_m, and/or $h_{\mu\nu}$) are Lorentz symmetric while each of the non-derivative terms involving a_μ or b_μ has been studied elsewhere. It is therefore interesting to isolate the dominant term including each derivative of an SME coefficient. These dominant effects are summarized in Table III.

Note that three derivatives, $\partial_0 a_0$, $\partial_0 b_0$, and $\partial_0 b_k$, are entirely absent from $H_{\rm NR}$. Moreover, the symmetric part of $\partial_j a_k$ only appears as a trace to leading order; the off-diagonal parts only appear when suppressed by h^{jk}. This echoes the appearance in conventional electrodynamics of $\partial_j A_k$ as part of $\frac{1}{2m}(\vec{p}-q\vec{A})^2$.

B. C, P, and T Analysis.

As an aside, we may use the correspondence between the Minkowski and curved-spacetime hamiltonians to study the C, P, and T properties of interactions associated with SME coefficients. The interesting coefficients that appear in $H_{\rm NR}$ are spacetime derivatives of a_ν and b_ν, namely, $\partial_\mu a_\nu$ and $\partial_\mu b_\nu$. In the nonrelativistic approximation, though, space and time components are separated. In addition, coupling to $h_{\mu\nu}$ may affect the CPT properties of some interactions.

In Table IV, we summarize the C, P, and T properties of operators connected to SME coefficients for free Dirac fermions.

From this table, the following rules can be extracted for relating the C, P, and T properties of interactions associated directly with a_μ and b_μ to the C, P, and T properties of interactions associated with their derivatives.

1. Application of a time derivative leaves C and P unchanged, but reverses T.
2. Application of a spatial derivative leaves C and T unchanged, but reverses P.
3. Multiplication by h_{00} or h_{jk} leaves all C, P, and T properties unchanged.
4. Multiplication by h^{k0} leaves C unchanged, but reverses both P and T.
5. Multiplication by i leaves P unchanged, but reverses both C and T.

These rules are summarized in Table V.

C. Sensitivity of Completed Experiments

While the Standard-Model Extension breaks particle Lorentz symmetry, it preserves observer symmetry. This means that its action takes the same form in every coordinate frame. If we restrict attention to frames where the metric can be written $g_{\mu\nu}=\eta_{\mu\nu}+h_{\mu\nu}$ with $|h_{\mu\nu}|\ll 0$, the action takes the form of Eq. (1). If we further restrict attention to nonrelativistic systems such as slow-moving atoms and nuclei, all prior results of the current work hold, including the nonrelativistic hamiltonian (8).

Systems that are of interest in connecting the SME to experiment include a frame attached to the surface of Earth and the Sun-centered non-rotating frame [8, 28–30] conventionally used for analysis of Lorentz violation. Sensitivity of experiments to the Minkowski-spacetime SME is typically expressed with respect to Sun-frame coordinates (T,X,Y,Z).

Evaluation of terms in Table II requires taking the nonconstant nature of the coefficients into account. For example, calculating the expectation value of the term $-\gamma^0\gamma^q\gamma_5 b_q$ in a state $|\psi\rangle$ involves an integral $\int d^3x\,|\psi(x)|^2\,b_q(x)$. In general, the spatial dependence of b_q will depend on the underlying theory, and so evaluation of this integral is model dependent. However, we may often make some progress by assuming that b_q does not vary strongly, and thus may be approximated by its average value over a relevant spatial region. In fact, once we decide to take seriously the notion that Lorentz-violation coefficients may vary with position, we are forced to interpret all published sensitivities (such as those summarized in Ref. [1]) in this or similar fashion. Many of the derivative terms may be treated in the same way without difficulty.

Once we make this approximation, we can immediately apply existing bounds on Minkowski-spacetime coefficients to many coefficient derivatives. For example, it has been found that $\left|\tilde{b}_X\right|\lesssim 10^{-33}$ GeV for the neutron [16]. In Minkowski spacetime, md_{XT} contributes to $\tilde{b}_X$, and so $\frac{1}{2m}(\partial_Y a_Z-\partial_Z a_Y)$ contributes to it in curved spacetime. The experiment determining this limit occurred on Earth's surface, so it bounds the average value of $(\partial_Y a_Z-\partial_Z a_Y)$ over the volume of the solar system swept out by Earth during its orbit. We therefore find that the average value of $|\partial_Y a_Z-\partial_Z a_Y|\lesssim 10^{-33}$ GeV^2 for neutrons. Several other bounds can be derived in similar fashion, and are listed as numbers without parentheses in Table VI.

Interpretation of the nonhermitian derivative terms is more complicated. Consider $\frac{1}{2}i\gamma^q\gamma_5\partial_q b_0/m$ again as an example. If we try to simply approximate $\partial_q b_0$ to an average value, then its expectation value for an atomic state yields an imaginary energy shift. This cannot be the entire story. As described earlier, this term is part-

Operator	Minkowski-spacetime coefficient	Weakly-curved-spacetime coefficient	Intuitive equivalent
$\mathbb{1}\frac{p_m}{m}$	$mc^{0m} + mc^{m0}$	$-\frac{\partial_{[j}b_{k]}}{4m}\varepsilon^{mj}{}_{p}\delta^{kp}$	$\mathrm{curl}(\vec{b})$
γ^0	$-mc_{00}$	$-\frac{i\partial_{(j}a_{k)}}{2m}\delta^{jk}$	$i\,\mathrm{div}(\vec{a})$
$\gamma^q\gamma_5$	md_{q0}	$\frac{\partial_{[j}a_{k]}}{2m}\varepsilon^{jk}{}_{q} + \frac{i\partial q b_0}{2m}$	$\mathrm{curl}(\vec{a}) + i\,\mathrm{grad}(b_0)$
$\gamma^0\gamma^q\gamma_5\frac{p_m}{m}$	$m\delta^{mk}d_{qk} + m\delta^m_q d_{00}$	$\frac{1}{4m}\varepsilon^{jm}{}_{q}\left(\partial_j a_0 - \partial_0 a_j\right)$	$\mathrm{grad}(a_0) - \partial_0\vec{a}$
		$+\frac{i\partial_{(j}b_{k)}}{4m}\varepsilon^{pj}{}_{q}\varepsilon^{km}{}_{p}$	$i\partial_{(j}b_{k)}$
		$-\frac{i\partial_{[j}b_{k]}}{4m}\left(\varepsilon^{pm}{}_{q}\varepsilon^{jk}{}_{p} + \varepsilon^{pj}{}_{q}\varepsilon^{mk}{}_{p}\right)$	$i\,\mathrm{curl}(\vec{b})$

TABLE III. Dominant appearance of each derivative. Note that $\partial_0 a_0$, $\partial_0 b_0$, and $\partial_0 b_k$ are absent, while only the trace part of $\partial_{(j}a_{k)}$ appears.

nered with $-\gamma^q\gamma_5 b_0 p_q/m$ to get a hermitian combination. To get a real number for the energy shift, we must take the nonconstant nature of b_0 seriously when evaluating the expectation value of the combined term $\gamma^q\gamma_5\left(\frac{-b_0 p_q + \frac{1}{2}i\partial_q b_0}{m}\right)$. Within this expression, there is significant interplay between $\partial_q b_0$ and the nonconstant nature of b_0; that interplay, in fact, is critical in finding a real energy shift. Determining the exact nature of the interplay, however, is problematic, and dependent on the underlying model.

Nevertheless, the expectation value of this combined term is likely to include order-one dependence on the average value of $\partial_q b_0/m$ over the relevant spatial region. Thus, we may make a rough but plausible estimate of the sensitivity of some experiments to $\partial_q b_0$. The results of this sort of analysis appear in Table VI with parentheses to denote the stronger assumptions that must be made in deriving these estimates.

V. SUMMARY

This work has studied the variance of SME Lorentz-violation coefficients with spacetime position. Such variation is likely to be necessary in curved spacetime. We have calculated the nonrelativistic hamiltonian that may be used for determining physical consequences of varying a_μ and b_μ coefficients. We found that nontrivial but solvable issues with hermiticity arise, and presented the C, P, and T properties of derivative-associated operators. Finally, we have found the maximal sensitivity of completed experiments to variation of SME coefficients.

Minkowski-Spacetime Coefficients	C	P	T	Weakly-Curved-Spacetime Coefficients
$c_{00},\ c_{jk}$	+	+	+	$h_{00},\ \hbar_{jk},\ i\partial_{(j}a_{k)}$
b_k	+	+	−	b_k
b_0	+	−	+	$b_0,\ b_k h^{k0}$
$c_{0j},\ c_{j0}$	+	−	−	$h^{j0},\ \partial_{[j}b_{k]}$
a_0	−	+	+	$a_0,\ a_k h^{k0}$
$d_{j0},\ d_{0j}$	−	+	−	$\partial_{[j}a_{k]},\ i\partial_j b_0,\ i\partial_j b_k h^{k0}$
$d_{00},\ d_{jk}$	−	−	+	$\partial_{[j}a_{0]},\ \partial_{[j}a_{k]}h^{k0},\ i\partial_{(j}b_{k)},\ i\partial_{[j}b_{k]}$
a_k	−	−	−	a_k

TABLE IV. C, P, and T properties associated with derivatives of SME coefficients.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported in part by Berry College and the Indiana University Center for Spacetime Symmetries (IUCSS).

	Effect on		
Factor	C	P	T
∂_0	+	+	−
∂_j	+	−	+
h_{00} or h_{jk}	+	+	+
h^{k0}	+	−	−
i	−	+	−

TABLE V. Rules for determining the C, P, and T properties of interactions associated with derivatives of a_μ and b_μ.

Weakly-curved-spacetime coefficient	Dominant sensitivity in terms of Minkowski-space coefficient	Sensitivity/GeV^2 and Reference					
		Electron		Proton		Neutron	
$\partial_{[X}a_{T]}$	$2m\left\lvert\tilde{H}_{XT}\right\rvert$	10^{-29}	[9]	–		10^{-26}	[19]
$\partial_{[Y}a_{T]}$	$2m\left\lvert\tilde{H}_{YT}\right\rvert$	10^{-29}	[9]	–		10^{-26}	[19]
$\partial_{[Z}a_{T]}$	$2m\left\lvert\tilde{H}_{ZT}\right\rvert$	10^{-29}	[9]	–		10^{-27}	[19]
$\partial_{[Y}a_{Z]}$	$m\left\lvert\tilde{b}_X\right\rvert$	10^{-34}	[9]	10^{-33}	[10]	10^{-33}	[16]
$\partial_{[Z}a_{X]}$	$m\left\lvert\tilde{b}_Y\right\rvert$	10^{-34}	[9]	10^{-33}	[10]	10^{-33}	[16]
$\partial_{[X}a_{Y]}$	$m\left\lvert\tilde{b}_Z\right\rvert$	10^{-32}	[9]	10^{-28}	[15]	10^{-29}	[16]
$\delta^{JK}\partial_J a_K$	$2m\lvert\tilde{c}_{TT}\rvert$	(10^{-21})	[12]	(10^{-11})	[21]	(10^{-11})	[21]
$\partial_X b_T$	$2m\left\lvert\tilde{b}_X\right\rvert$	(10^{-34})	[9]	(10^{-33})	[10]	(10^{-33})	[16]
$\partial_Y b_T$	$2m\left\lvert\tilde{b}_Y\right\rvert$	(10^{-34})	[9]	(10^{-33})	[10]	(10^{-33})	[16]
$\partial_Z b_T$	$2m\left\lvert\tilde{b}_Z\right\rvert$	(10^{-32})	[9]	(10^{-28})	[15]	(10^{-29})	[15]
$\partial_{(Y}b_{Z)}$	$2m\left\lvert\tilde{d}_{YZ}\right\rvert$	(10^{-29})	[9]	–		(10^{-26})	[19]
$\partial_{(Y}b_{Z)}$	$4m\left\lvert\tilde{H}_{XT}\right\rvert$	(10^{-29})	[9]	–		(10^{-26})	[19]
$\partial_{(Z}b_{X)}$	$2m\left\lvert\tilde{d}_{ZX}\right\rvert$	(10^{-29})	[9]	–		–	
$\partial_{(Z}b_{X)}$	$4m\left\lvert\tilde{H}_{YT}\right\rvert$	(10^{-29})	[9]	–		(10^{-26})	[19]
$\partial_{(X}b_{Y)}$	$2m\left\lvert\tilde{d}_{XY}\right\rvert$	(10^{-29})	[9]	–		(10^{-27})	[19]
$\partial_{(X}b_{Y)}$	$4m\left\lvert\tilde{H}_{ZT}\right\rvert$	(10^{-29})	[9]	–		(10^{-27})	[19]
$\partial_{[Y}b_{Z]}$	$2m\lvert\tilde{c}_{TX}\rvert$	10^{-21}	[11, 13]	10^{-20}	[17]	10^{-5}	[21]
$\partial_{[Y}b_{Z]}$	$2m\left\lvert\tilde{H}_{XT}\right\rvert$	(10^{-29})	[9]	–		(10^{-26})	[19]
$\partial_{[Z}b_{X]}$	$2m\lvert\tilde{c}_{TY}\rvert$	10^{-21}	[11, 13]	10^{-20}	[17]	10^{-5}	[21]
$\partial_{[Z}b_{X]}$	$2m\left\lvert\tilde{H}_{YT}\right\rvert$	(10^{-29})	[9]	–		(10^{-26})	[19]
$\partial_{[X}b_{Y]}$	$2m\lvert\tilde{c}_{TZ}\rvert$	10^{-23}	[11, 13]	10^{-20}	[17]	10^{-5}	[21]
$\partial_{[X}b_{Y]}$	$2m\left\lvert\tilde{H}_{ZT}\right\rvert$	(10^{-29})	[9]	–		(10^{-27})	[19]

TABLE VI. Maximal sensitivity to derivatives of SME coefficients from already-completed experiments. Sensitivities written with parentheses require further assumptions than those written without parentheses.

[1] V. A. Kostelecký and N. Russell, Rev. Mod. Phys. **83**, 11 (2011), arXiv:0801.0287 [hep-ph].

[2] C. M. Will, Living Rev. Rel. **9**, 3 (2006), arXiv:gr-qc/0510072 [gr-qc].

[3] V. A. Kostelecký and R. Potting, Phys. Rev. **D51**, 3923 (1995), arXiv:hep-ph/9501341 [hep-ph].

[4] D. Colladay and V. A. Kostelecký, Phys. Rev. **D55**, 6760 (1997), arXiv:hep-ph/9703464 [hep-ph].

[5] D. Colladay and V. A. Kostelecký, Phys. Rev. **D58**, 116002 (1998), arXiv:hep-ph/9809521 [hep-ph].

[6] V. A. Kostelecký, Phys. Rev. **D69**, 105009 (2004), arXiv:hep-th/0312310 [hep-th].

[7] V. A. Kostelecký and M. Mewes, Phys. Rev. **D88**, 096006 (2013), arXiv:1308.4973 [hep-ph].

[8] V. A. Kostelecký and C. D. Lane, Phys. Rev. **D60**, 116010 (1999), arXiv:hep-ph/9908504 [hep-ph].

[9] B. R. Heckel, E. G. Adelberger, C. E. Cramer, T. S. Cook, S. Schlamminger, and U. Schmidt, Phys. Rev. **D78**, 092006 (2008), arXiv:0808.2673 [hep-ex].

[10] T. Kornack, G. Vasilakis, and M. Romalis, in *CPT and Lorentz symmetry. Proceedings, 4th Meeting, Bloomington,* edited by V. A. Kostelecký (World Scientific, Singapore, 2008) pp. 206–213.

[11] M. A. Hohensee, N. Leefer, D. Budker, C. Harabati, V. A. Dzuba, and V. V. Flambaum, Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 050401 (2013), arXiv:1303.2747 [hep-ph].

[12] B. Altschul, Phys. Rev. **D82**, 016002 (2010), arXiv:1005.2994 [hep-ph].

[13] B. Altschul, Phys. Rev. **D74**, 083003 (2006), arXiv:hep-ph/0608332 [hep-ph].

[14] Y. V. Stadnik and V. V. Flambaum, Eur. Phys. J. **C75**, 110 (2015), arXiv:1408.2184 [hep-ph].

[15] S. K. Peck, D. K. Kim, D. Stein, D. Orbaker, A. Foss, M. T. Hummon, and L. R. Hunter, Phys. Rev. **A86**, 012109 (2012).

[16] J. M. Brown, S. J. Smullin, T. W. Kornack, and M. V. Romalis, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 151604 (2010), arXiv:1006.5425 [physics.atom-ph].

[17] P. Wolf, F. Chapelet, S. Bize, and A. Clairon, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 060801 (2006), arXiv:hep-ph/0601024 [hep-ph].

[18] F. Allmendinger, W. Heil, S. Karpuk, W. Kilian, A. Scharth, U. Schmidt, A. Schnabel, Yu. Sobolev, and K. Tullney, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 110801 (2014), arXiv:1312.3225 [gr-qc].

[19] F. Cane, D. Bear, D. F. Phillips, M. S. Rosen, C. L. Smallwood, R. E. Stoner, R. L. Walsworth, and V. A. Kostelecký, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 230801 (2004), arXiv:physics/0309070 [physics].

[20] V. A. Kostelecký and J. D. Tasson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 010402 (2009), arXiv:0810.1459 [gr-qc].

[21] V. A. Kostelecký and J. D. Tasson, Phys. Rev. **D83**, 016013 (2011), arXiv:1006.4106 [gr-qc].

[22] M. D. Seifert, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 201601 (2010), arXiv:1008.0324 [hep-th].

[23] One simple example is $\mathbf{R} \times S^2$. Its Riemann tensor is nonzero, but nonzero vector field $a_\mu = (1, 0, 0)$ satisfies $D_\alpha a_\mu \equiv 0$.

[24] R. Lehnert, J. Math. Phys. **45**, 3399 (2004), arXiv:hep-ph/0401084 [hep-ph].

[25] L. L. Foldy and S. A. Wouthuysen, Phys. Rev. **78**, 29 (1950).

[26] V. A. Kostelecký and C. D. Lane, J. Math. Phys. **40**, 6245 (1999), arXiv:hep-ph/9909542 [hep-ph].

[27] J. D. Bjorken and S. D. Drell, *Relativistic quantum mechanics* (McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1964).

[28] R. Bluhm, V. A. Kostelecký, C. D. Lane, and N. Russell, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 090801 (2002), arXiv:hep-ph/0111141 [hep-ph].

[29] R. Bluhm, V. A. Kostelecký, C. D. Lane, and N. Russell, Phys. Rev. **D68**, 125008 (2003), arXiv:hep-ph/0306190 [hep-ph].

[30] V. A. Kostelecký and M. Mewes, Phys. Rev. **D66**, 056005 (2002), arXiv:hep-ph/0205211 [hep-ph].